

REMARKS

(1) Claims 1-14 and 21-27 are pending in the present application. Claims 15-20 are cancelled herein. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, and 14 have been amended. Applicant adds new claims 21-27, but no new matter has been added.

(2) The Office Action cited the following references:

A. U.S. Patent 5,949,105, by Moslehi, entitled *Insulated-Gate Field Effect Transistor Structure and Method* (referred to as "Moslehi" hereinafter); and

B. U.S. Patent 6,258,680, by Fulford Jr., et al., entitled *Integrated Circuit Gate Conductor Which Uses Layered Spacers to Produce a Graded Junction* (referred to as "Fulford" hereinafter).

(3) Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over Moslehi in view of Fulford. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the following reasons.

Claims 1, 2, and 6

Applicant amended claim 1 herein, and claims 2 and 6 depend from claim 1. The cited references do not disclose, teach, suggest, or motivate "forming a second spacer adjacent the first spacer, wherein the second spacer comprises a low thermal budget oxide formed with a thermal budget of less than 600 degrees Celsius," as claim 1 requires. Because none of the references teach the claimed invention, combinations of these references cannot teach the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Because claims 2 and 6 depend from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 6 are patentable over the cited references because of their dependency from independent claim 1 for the reasons discussed above.

TSM02-1262

Page 9 of 12

Claims 8, 9, 11, and 13

Applicant amended claim 8 herein, and claims 9 and 13 depend from claim 8. The cited references do not disclose, teach, suggest, or motivate "forming a second spacer adjacent the first spacer, wherein the second spacer comprises a low thermal budget oxide formed with a thermal budget of less than 600 degrees Celsius," as claim 8 requires. Because none of the references teach the claimed invention, combinations of these references cannot teach the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 8 is patentable over the cited references. Because claims 9 and 13 depend from claim 8, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 13 are patentable over the cited references because of their dependency from independent claim 8 for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 are discussed in the next section because their dependencies have changed.

(4) In the Office Action, claims 5, 7, 12, and 14 were objected to for being dependent upon rejected base claims, but were considered allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their respective base claims.

Claim 5

Claim 5 was rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its prior base claim (i.e., claim 1). Thus, the objection to claim 5 is overcome and claim 5 is allowable.

Claims 3, 4, and 7

Claim 7 was rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its prior base claim (i.e., claim 1). Thus, the objection to claim 7 is overcome and claim 7 is allowable.

Because claims 3 and 4 now depend from claim 7, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3 and 4 are allowable because of their dependency from independent claim 7.

Claims 10-12

Claim 12 was rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its prior base claim (i.e., claim 8). Thus, the objection to claim 12 is overcome and claim 12 is allowable.

Because claims 10 and 11 now depend from claim 12, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10 and 11 are allowable because of their dependency from independent claim 12.

Claim 14

Claim 14 was rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its prior base claim (i.e., claim 8). Thus, the objection to claim 14 is overcome and claim 14 is allowable.

(5) Applicant added new claims 21-27 herein.

Claims 21-27

The cited references do not disclose, teach, suggest, or motivate “implanting impurities into the substrate using the gate electrode as an implant mask to form HALO pocket regions” and “implanting impurities into the substrate using the gate electrode as an implant mask to form lightly-doped regions in the substrate, wherein at least part of the HALO pocket regions extend below the lightly-doped regions,” as claim 21 requires. Because none of the references teach the claimed invention, combinations of these references cannot teach the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 21 is patentable over the cited references. Because claims 22-27 depend from claim 21, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 22-27 are also patentable over the cited references because of their dependency from independent claim 21 for the reasons discussed above.

(6) In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issuance. If the Examiner should have any questions, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney (contact information provided below). In the event that there are any additional fees due to keep this case pending, please charge the such fees, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

7/10/2004
Date


Barry W. Dove
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 45,862

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd.
Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel. 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218

TSM02-1262

Page 12 of 12